UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/740,908	12/19/2000	Kathryn L. Parker	MS155646.1/40062.87-US-01	5955

7590 11/20/2003	EXAMINER
Homer L. Knearl	CHANDRASEKHAR, PRANAV
Merchant & Gould P.C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2185	

Homer L. Knearl
Merchant & Gould P.C
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 December 2000* .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
           application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .	
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6) ☐ Other: .	

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public
> use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United
> States.

1. Claims 1, 5, 10,11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly

anticipated by Launzel [US Pat No. 4179733].

2. As per claims 1 and 11, Launzel teaches

receiving an internally generated locking signal [col. 3 lines 51-57].

setting a locked flag to indicate the user input elements are locked [col. 4 lines 2-5];

ignoring input signals when the locked flag is set [col. 4 lines 30-33; col. 5 lines 18-

20].

3. As per claims 5 and 14, Launzel teaches the internal generation of a locking

signal following a predetermined time interval wherein the predetermined time interval is

managed by the timer. [col. 3 lines 51-57]

4. As per claim 10, Launzel teaches a computer system that comprises:

user interface input elements. [col. 2 lines 42-44]

a processing unit for recognizing user interface input signals. [col. 2 lines 42-50]

a locking application for locking the user interface elements, wherein the processing unit

ignores user interface input signals when the user interface elements are locked and

wherein the locking application receives an internally generated lock signal. [col. 5 lines

11-20;col. 3 lines 51-57].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2-4,12 and13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Launzel et al. [US Pat No. 4179733] in view of Martensson [US Pat

No. 5241683].

6. As per claims 2 and 12, Launzel teaches the internal generation of a locking signal

following which the keyboard of a computer enters a lockout mode in which a locked

flag is set. In this mode, the computer system ignores all input signals from the

keyboard for a predetermined period of time after it has entered the lockout mode.

Launzel does not explicitly teach the manual unlocking of the keyboard using a correct

combination of keystrokes (i.e. input signals) of the keyboard.

Martensson teaches:

determining whether input signals relate to an unlock signal [col. 5 lines 10-21]

if input signals do not relate to an unlock signal, ignore the input signal. [col. 5

lines 10-21]

if input signals relate to an unlock signal, unlocking the user input elements. [col. 5

lines 10-21]

In summary, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that Martensson's

concept of manually unlocking the user interface has been combined with the teachings

of Launzel mentioned earlier since it would be advantageous for the user of the

computing device to be able to remove the user input interface from the lockout mode

manually as opposed to waiting for the predetermined period of time of the lockout.

7. As per claim 3, Launzel teaches a method in which a locking signal is internally

generated followed by the setting of a locked flag. All input signals received from the

keyboard are ignored as long as the locked flag is set. Launzel does not explicitly teach

a method of determining whether consecutive input signals from the user interface

relate to an unlocking signal wherein the signals (a result of the button presses) are

received within a predetermined period.

Martensson teaches a method wherein button presses create the input signals and

the act of determining whether the input signals relate to an unlock signal comprises:

determining whether the button presses occur within a predetermined time period

[col. 6 lines 2-7].

In summary, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that the teachings of Launzel

have been combined with Martensson's concept of determining if input signals occurring

within a predetermined time period relate to an unlocking signal. It would be

advantageous for the input signals to be received within a predetermined period of time

to prevent inadvertent unlocking of the user input interface.

8. As per claim 4, Launzel does not explicitly teach a method wherein a message is

displayed indicating that the user input interface is locked. Martensson teaches a

display message indicating that the user input elements are locked. [col. 5 lines 24-28]

In summary, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that the teachings of

Launzel have been combined with those of Martensson since it would be advantageous

for the user to know that the user input interface is locked without having to attempt

using the interface.

9. Claims 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Launzel et al [US Pat No. 4179733] in view of Gavrilovic et al [US Pat No. 6422145].

Launzel teaches a method in which a locking signal is internally generated

followed by the setting of a locked flag. All input signals received from the keyboard are

ignored as long as the locked flag is set

Launzel further teaches an invention in which signals from the keyboard are

ignored after a predetermined time interval of inactivity of the keyboard thus indicating

that the keyboard can enter a lock state automatically. Launzel does not explicitly teach

the system entering a power-saving mode or sleep mode after the input interface has

been locked (i.e. the system does not enter the sleep mode after a predetermined time

period of inactivity of the user input interface).

Gavrilovic teaches an invention in which a microcontroller waits for a fixed time period for specific signals. In the event that no signals are received within a predetermined time frame, the microcontroller will go to "sleep" and will ignore all incoming signals thereafter [col. 10 lines 30-36].

In summary, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that the concept of locking the user input interface taught by Martensson and Launzel has been improved further by combining their teachings with that of Gavrilovic's concept of setting the system into a "sleep" mode to conserve power.

10. Claims 8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Launzel [US Pat No. 4179733] in view of Keen [US Pat No. 5526422].

Launzel substantially teaches a method wherein a locking signal is internally generated and locked flag is set in a locked mode followed by input signals from the keyboard being ignored as long as the locked flag is set. Launzel's method teaches a keyboard as the user interface element that is locked. Martensson does not teach a method in which the user interface element being locked is a touch screen.

Keen teaches an invention in which the user input element is a touch-screen. While Keen does not explicitly state the internal generation of a locking signal or the setting of a locked flag, his method incorporates the concept of a "clean screen" mode (screen lockout mode) in which the processor of the device ignores all signals received from the touch screen module [col. 5 lines 46-50].

In summary, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that the teachings of

Launzel have been combined with Keen's teachings that incorporate the use of a touch

screen as the user input element for his invention.

11. Claims 7 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Launzel [US Pat No. 4179733] in view of Borgendale et al [US Pat No. 6457132].

Launzel substantially teaches a method wherein a locking signal is internally

generated and locked flag is set following which input signals from the keyboard are

ignored as long as the locked flag is set. Launzel does not explicitly teach a method

wherein the computer device comprises a calendar-type application program that

internally generates a locking signal in response to a predetermined event. Hence,

Launzel's teachings do not include the lockout mode being controlled by a calendar-

type application program.

Borgendale teaches a method in which a calendar-type application program

comprises of a calendar that has event entries. A specific power management mode is

associated with each of these event entries. During the operation of the computer

system, when a certain time and date for an entry is reached, the calendar automatically

sends the corresponding power management event to the operating system manager.

Hence, the mode of power consumption may be altered depending on predetermined

event entries in a calendar [col. 3 lines 27-32; col. 3 lines 44-47; col. 3 lines 51-54; col.

3 lines 63-65; col. 4 lines 19-23; col. 5 lines 26-34].

A calendar-type application program similar to that taught by Borgendale may be

employed to automatically set the user input interface into a lockout mode by

associating event entries in a calendar with a lockout mode.

In summary, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that the teachings of

Launzel have been combined with Borgendale's concept of controlling the power mode

of a device by a calendar-type application program containing predetermined event

entries to facilitate the automatic generation of a locking signal by a calendar-type

application program.

12. Claims 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Launzel [US Pat No. 4179733] in view of Gavrilovic et al [US Pat No. 6422145] and

further in view of Borgendale et al [US Pat No. 6457132].

13. Launzel substantially teaches a method wherein a locking signal is internally

generated and locked flag is set following which input signals from the keyboard are

ignored as long as the locked flag is set. Launzel does not explicitly teach a method

wherein the computer device enters a sleep mode after a predetermined time period.

Launzel further does not teach a method that comprises a calendar-type application

program that provides reminder notifications to the user and in doing so, awakens the

device from sleep mode when the reminder occurs during sleep mode, and ignores

input signals after a predetermined period of time.

Gavrilovic teaches an invention in which a microcontroller waits for a fixed time

period for specific signals. In the event that no signals are received within a

predetermined time frame, the microcontroller will go to "sleep" and will ignore all

incoming signals thereafter [col. 10 lines 30-36]. Gavrilovic does not teach a method in

which a calendar-type application program provides reminder notifications to the user thus awakening the device from sleep mode and ignoring the input signals after a predetermined period of time.

Borgendale teaches a method in which a calendar-type application program comprises of a calendar that has event entries. A specific power management mode is associated with each of these event entries. During the operation of the computer system, when a certain time and date for an entry is reached, the calendar automatically sends the corresponding power management event to the operating system manager. Hence, the mode of power consumption may be altered depending on predetermined event entries in a calendar [col. 3 lines 27-32; col. 3 lines 44-47; col. 3 lines 51-54; col. 3 lines 63-65; col. 4 lines 19-23; col. 5 lines 26-34].

A calendar-type application program similar to that taught by Borgendale may be employed to automatically set the user input interface into a sleep mode by associating event entries in a calendar with a power-consumption mode (such as a sleep mode). The event entries in a calendar-type application program may also be associated with notifications that are provided to the user. A notification that occurs in a sleep mode can enable the calendar-type application program to awaken the computer device from a sleep mode.

In summary, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that the teachings of Launzel and Gavrilovic have been combined with Borgendale's concept of controlling the power mode of a device by a calendar-type application program containing predetermined event entries to facilitate the removal of a computer device from sleep

mode by providing notifications to the user whereby the notifications are encompassed

in event entries of the calendar-type application program.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Pranav Chandrasekhar whose telephone number is

703-305-8647. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 a.m.-5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Thomas Lee can be reached on 703-305-9717. The fax phone numbers for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for

regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-

2100.

Pranav Chandrasekhar
October 31,2003

THOMAS LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100